



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 09/749,629 | 12/28/2000 | Surendra Goel | 06975-152001/ SEARCH 04 | 5986 |
| 26171 | 7590 | 06/09/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022 | | | MIZRAHI, DIANE D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2165 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,629

Applicant(s)

GOEL, SURENDRA

Examiner

DIANE D. MIZRAHI

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-78 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-78 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-25-05.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

III. DETAILED ACTION

Claims 44-78 are presented for examination.

Applicant's newly submitted 17 sheets of formal drawings (acceptable drawings) have been placed in Applicant's file and newly submitted Information Disclosure Statement is acknowledged. In light of the newly submitted Information Disclosure Statement, all previous office actions are withdrawn as being moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 44-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. (Patent No. 6,275,820 A1 and Navin hereinafter) in view of Erick Schneider (US Patent No. US 6,442,549 B1 and Schneider hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 44 and 63, Navin teaches system for storing searchable content, the system comprising: a first

Art Unit: 2165

electronic region that includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites (col 2, lines 23-50) and that is populated by automatically scanning and storing the text of a web site when the web site is accessed a threshold number of times by members of a web host (col 2, lines 23-67); and a second electronic region that includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and that is populated by automatically scanning and storing the text of a web site provided by a that was not accessed the threshold number of times by members of the web host (col 2, lines 23-67).

Navin does not teach listing service.

Schneider teaches listing service (col 26, line s34-51).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Navin with the teachings of Schneider to include claimed, "listing service" with the motivation to provide for a sophisticated ... on-line search system (Schneider, col 1, line 50).

Regarding Claim 45, Navin teaches ... full text displayed by different web pages from different web sites (col 2, lines 41-49).

Regarding Claim 46, Navin teaches ... include titles, descriptions, and addresses displayed by different web pages from different web sites (col 2, lines 50-67).

Regarding Claim 47, Navin teaches an alphanumeric symbol (Figure 3B).

Regarding Claim 48, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches introductory pages, (col 7, lines 52-61) see also (col 9, lines 22-31) and search terms (col 3, lines 1-19) and a web site identifier (col 2, lines 50-67).

Regarding Claim 49, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches full text introductory pages (col 9, lines 20-31).

Regarding Claim 50, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches searching and a web site identifier (col 2, lines 50-67).

Regarding Claim 51, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches storing... (col 2, lines 50-67).

Art Unit: 2165

Regarding Claim 52, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches web site address (col 2, lines 50-67) (col 5, line 19).

Regarding Claim 53, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin teaches web site (col 2, lines 50-67).

Regarding Claims 54-55 and 57, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Navin does not teach listing service.

Schneider teaches listing service (col 26, line s34-51).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Navin with the teachings of Schneider to include claimed, "listing service" with the motivation to provide for a sophisticated ... on-line search system (Schneider, col 1, line 50).

Regarding Claim 56, Navin teaches ... collecting the full content of a web site... (col 2, lines 23-40).

Regarding Claims 58-62, Navin teaches does not expressly teach web pages including images, video and audio.

Art Unit: 2165

Schneider teaches web pages including images, video and audio (col 15, lines 65-67 to col 16, lines 1-11) (col 15, lines 32-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Navin with the teachings of Schneider to include claimed, "web pages including images, video and audio" with the motivation to provide for a sophisticated ... on-line search system (Schneider, col 1, line 50).

Regarding Claims 64-78, these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above and are therefore rejected as set forth above.

Other Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied with Office actions. Examiners advises the Applicant that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic

Art Unit: 2165


Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane D. Mizrahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 305-3900 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Diane Mizrahi
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

May 31, 2005